



Re: OU-1 cleanup work

gordon sullivan

to:

DC Orr, Mike Cirian, Michelle Hartly, Carol Campbell, FilmWest

06/21/2010 09:24 AM

Cc:

Andy Lensink, Bill Murray, brad, catharine_ransom, clecours, suzi rios, Freya Margand, Helen Dawson, jpodolinsky, Kirby Campbell-Rierson, larry.anderson, Lawrence Grandison, mvolesky, Rebecca Thomas, rodriguez-newstroml, Sean Earle, Ted Linnert, Terry Spear, Victor Ketellapper, Virginia Sloan, jim.hammons, glena.young

Show Details

Michelle,

Do you or anyone you know have contacts in Fox News, or CNN??

Gordon Sullivan

--- On Fri, 6/18/10, FilmWest <filmwest@gmail.com> wrote:

From: FilmWest <filmwest@gmail.com>

Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work

To: "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com>, "DC Orr" <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>,

Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov, "Michelle Hartly" <michelle@filmwestllc.com>,

Campbell.Carol@epamail.epa.gov

Cc: Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov, Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov, brad@libbyasbestos.org,

catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov, clecours@mt.gov, "suzy rios" <five_rivers@ymail.com>,

Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov, Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov, jpodolinsky@mt.gov, "Kirby Campbell-

Rierson" <kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov>, larry.anderson@mail.house.gov,

Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov, mvolesky@mt.gov, Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov, rodriguez-

newstroml@cdm.com, Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov, Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov, "Terry Spear"

<tspear@mttech.edu>, Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov, "Virginia Sloan"

<virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov>, jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com, glena.young@cityoflibby.com

Date: Friday, June 18, 2010, 8:11 AM

Poor Ted . He's apparently drunk on his power and thinks he's a Jedi Master.

On 6/15/10 8:24 AM, "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com> wrote:

Ted Linnert has rapidly misrepresented the truth such as the time he ensured the Libby community they would receive 12, 15, even 20 % interest on the W.R. Grace settlement funds. This among other representations was the reason the community agreed to settle with Grace. When he was challenged on his comments, which were on tape, the man said " I didn't say that." Everyone in the room was amazed as to the level of his dishonesty but learned quickly never to trust a word he says. His word-smithing of important information surrounding issues of public health and safety have cause real problems for the cleanup and the people involved. Here's a man who actually showed up in a high school classroom to solicit negative comments about the performance of CAG, which ended up causing a split which has never been repaired in our community. Mr. Linnert and his whole "social marketing strategy" should be the topic of federal investigation. You should not rely on a thing he says !!!!!

If you need the source of Mr. Linnert's work in Libby it is all a matter of record!!!!

Good Luck

Gordon Sullivan

--- On Tue, 6/15/10, Michelle Hartly <michelle@filmwestllc.com> wrote:

From: Michelle Hartly <michelle@filmwestllc.com>
 Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work
 To: "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com>, "DC Orr" <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>, Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov
 Cc: Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov, Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov, brad@libbyasbestos.org, catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov, clecours@mt.gov, "suzi rios" <five_rivers@ymail.com>, Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov, Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov, jpodolinsky@mt.gov, "Kirby Campbell-Rierson" <kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov>, larry.anderson@mail.house.gov, Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov, mvolesky@mt.gov, Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov, rodriguez-newstroml@cdm.com, Earle.Sea@epamail.epa.gov, Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov, "Terry Spear" <tspear@mttech.edu>, Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov, "Virginia Sloan" <virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov>, jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com, glena.young@cityoflibby.com
 Date: Tuesday, June 15, 2010, 12:51 AM

Is this CIC (LINNERT) really still collecting money from US taxpayers?
 Can someone review his performance?

Someone may want to inform him of the facts, which he consistently misrepresents.

1. Re; "encouraging air samples" ---

See data from EPA report

<http://www.epa.gov/libby/AmbientAirReportFinal09Feb2009.pdf>

(HAS ANYONE READ THE EPA REPORT DATED 2/09/2009 ? OR ANY OF THE EPA REPORTS?)

Risk calculations based on mean outdoor ambient air concentrations, rather than the 95th UCL, represent an additional source of uncertainty. A consequence of the lack of a method for calculating the 95th UCL, **this uncertainty could result in an underestimation of risk.**

Uncertainty in the Cancer Exposure-Response Relationship

The method currently recommended for evaluating cancer risk from inhalation exposure to asbestos (USEPA 2008) has some potential limitations, as follows:

- The unit risk values reported by USEPA (1986) and used by USEPA (2008) are based on measures of exposure expressed as PCM fibers, without any distinction to mineral type (chrysotile, amphibole). However, there are a number of studies which suggest that mineral type may be an important determinant of potency, with amphibole tending to be somewhat more potent than chrysotile, at least for mesothelioma (e.g., Hodgson and Darnton 2000). To the extent that amphibole is more potent than chrysotile,

use of the current method may tend to underestimate risks in Libby, where the mineral form of concern is amphibole.

- The unit risk values are based on observations of cancer occurrence in workers exposed to asbestos in the workplace, and do not address susceptible populations or episodic exposures.
- The unit risk values represent the central tendency estimates of the potency factors, not an upper bound on the values. This is especially important, because exposure estimates provided in the epidemiological reports that are used to derive the potency and unit risk values are often highly uncertain, and hence the true unit risk values might be either higher or lower than the values selected.

An additional concern is that the cancer unit risks derived by USEPA (1986) and USEPA (2008) are based on mortality statistics from the 1970's. Thus, they may not be applicable to populations that are exposed to asbestos today.

In particular, as life expectancy has increased, the risk of developing cancer from an exposure to asbestos has also tended to increase.

Thus, cancer risk predications based on the current method may tend to be too low by about 20%.

2) ER VS HOMEOWNER.

ER WAS NOT PRESENT WHEN SUZANNE RIOS PURCHASED HER HOME. REGARDLESS, IS IT THE EPA'S POSITION THAT IT IS APPROPRIATE TO OPERATE A SUPERFUND HEADQUARTERS IN A SCHOOL ZONE, RESIDENTIAL AREA NEXT TO CHILDREN>????

3) RE: BUYOUT

THE CIC IS MISINFORMED AND NOW MISREPRESENTS FEDERAL POLICIES. A BUYOUT IS AN OPTION UNDER THE EPA GUIDELINES.
CAN SOMEONE ANSWER THE QUESTION AS POSED?

THANK YOU,

MICHELLE HARTLY

On 6/14/10 4:52 PM, "five_rivers@ymail.com" <five_rivers@ymail.com>

wrote:

>
 > Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry
 >
 > -----Original Message-----
 > From: Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov
 > Date: Mon, 14 Jun 2010 14:15:31
 > To: <five_rivers@ymail.com>
 > Cc: <Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov>;
 > <Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov>;
 > <Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov>; <Faulk.Libby@epamail.epa.gov>;
 > <Pennock.Sonya@epamail.epa.gov>; <emack@lockelord.com>
 > Subject: 188 Mahoney Road
 >
 >
 > Hello Ms. Rios,
 >
 > Thank you for the message that appears below. EPA is not "buying out"
 > any property in Libby and does not even have the authority to do so.
 > For the record, ER began leasing the property next to your house in
 > 2002, which is before you moved into the neighborhood. You moved in
 > next to ER, not the other way around. According to the Libby Area
 > Chamber of Commerce, the local real estate market is relatively strong
 > so you should be able to sell your house without difficulty.
 >
 > EPA began its first round of the current ambient air sampling program in
 > 2007. The third round of ambient air sampling began last May. All
 > rounds of this sampling effort included a monitor in ER's equipment
 > yard. As you can see below, the results are very encouraging:
 >
 > Date of Sampling Ambient Air
 > Concentration
 >
 >

 > Pre- 1990, City Center 0.59 s/cc
 >
 > 2002 Lincoln County 0.00010 to
 > Courthouse Annex 0.00086 s/cc
 >
 > 2008 Average OU4 0.0000056 s/cc
 > Monitoring stations
 >
 > Ted Linnert
 > Office of Communication & Public Involvement
 >
 > U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 8 - OC
 > 1595 Wynkoop Street
 > Denver, CO 80202-1129
 >
 > (303) 312-6119 / fax (303) 312-7110
 > toll free: 1-800-227-8917 x6119
 > linnert.ted@epa.gov
 >

>

>

> From: five_rivers@ymail.com

>

> To: Victor Ketellapper/R8/USEPA/US@EPA, Mike

Cirian/R8/USEPA/US@EPA,

> filmwest@gmail.com, "DC Orr"

> <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>, "Catherine Ransom"

> <catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov>, "Gordon Sullivan"

> <gordsull@yahoo.com>

>

> Date: 06/08/2010 11:07 PM

>

> Subject: Re:

>

>

>

>

>

>

> EPA/ER continue their status quo clean up activities. As a land owner

> who has lost confidence in EPA/ER's decision making and inept

> leadership, I request to be bought out and be saved from the Titanic

> sinking ship disaster that EPA/ER have created in Libby, MT. EPA/ER

> continues to contaminate and devalue my property on 188 Mahoney Rd in

> Libby. Please respond with your action plan to buy my EPA/ER

> contaminated/devalued property. Enough is enough. I moved because of
the

> increased health risks brought about by ER moving next door to my

> property and blowing around contaminants in the air. There has been no

> follow through from EPA/ER's promise to monitor the air quality as

> stated by Mike and Ted to residents on Mahoney Rd. I have several

> documented conversations with EPA/ER staff regarding health and safety

> issues, with no follow through on the part of EPA/ER. Please put me on

> the list for the buyout.

>

> Sincerely, Suzanne Rios

> Sent from my Verizon Wireless BlackBerry

>

>

On 6/14/10 9:25 AM, "gordon sullivan" <gordsull@yahoo.com> wrote:

Mr. Cirian,

I await a response to my question if 'YOU DENY THAT A GROUP OF ER EMPLOYEES WERE DISMISSED BECAUSE THEY FAILED A DRUG TEST????

Thank you,
Gordon Sullivan

--- On Mon, 6/7/10, Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov
<Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov> wrote:

From: Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov
<Cirian.Mike@epamail.epa.gov>
Subject: Re: OU-1 cleanup work
To: "DC Orr" <xcav8orr@hotmail.com>
Cc: Lensink.Andy@epamail.epa.gov,
Murray.Bill@epamail.epa.gov,
brad@libbyasbestos.org,
catharine_ransom@baucus.senate.gov,
clecours@mt.gov, filmwest@gmail.com, "suzi rios"
<five_rivers@ymail.com>,
Margand.Freya@epamail.epa.gov,
gordsull@yahoo.com,
Dawson.Helen@epamail.epa.gov,
jpodolinsky@mt.gov, "Kirby Campbell-Rierson"
<kirby_campbell-rierson@baucus.senate.gov>,
larry.anderson@mail.house.gov,
Grandison.Lawrence@epamail.epa.gov,
mvolesky@mt.gov,
Thomas.Rebecca@epamail.epa.gov, rodriguez-
newstroml@cdm.com, Earle.Sean@epamail.epa.gov,
Linnert.Ted@epamail.epa.gov, "Terry Spear"
<tspear@mtech.edu>,
Ketellapper.Victor@epamail.epa.gov, "Virginia
Sloan" <virginia_sloan@tester.senate.gov>,
jim.hammons@cityoflibby.com,
glena.young@cityoflibby.com
Date: Monday, June 7, 2010, 3:26 PM

Mr. Orr;

This is in response to concerns you raised regarding the City's installation of a waterline at the former Export Plant property. EPA has coordinated closely with the City Administrator, city crew and the City's engineering firm to assist the City with this waterline extension project. EPA agreed to excavate two portions of the

trench through suspected or known areas of contamination. The City agreed to excavate the connecting portion of the line that runs parallel to the river. The City's contractor and engineering firm would provide the installation and oversight of the waterline distribution and service connections.

Throughout the length of the project, EPA was available to provide oversight, respond to questions, or offer additional assistance for any work where the City might have encountered vermiculite or asbestos contamination. The City's contractor, who is trained and certified for asbestos work, was informed of EPA's offer of assistance during a pre-construction meeting. The City's contractors did not contact EPA for assistance. EPA coordination with the City Administrator and city workers was excellent.

As you have identified, there is an area near the ramp access where suspect materials will be covered with a single lift (approximately 6 inches) of clean fill and a barrier has been placed to delineate that transition zone and all other areas were covered with 12 inches of common fill. Remediation of this area, along with the rest of the former Export Plant property, will be completed once EPA implements the remedy selected in the Record of Decision (May 2010).

I can assure you that EPA's contractor and the city crew excavating the trenches did not cross contaminate the site, nor did they track vermiculite or asbestos contamination off site. When the excavation was completed, EPA turned the project over to the City and its' engineering firm for completion of the waterline extension project.

Regarding the rumors about any recent personnel actions, they are rumors and are not true.

Sincerely,

Mike Cirian, PE
US EPA
Remedial Project Manager

;;
OU-1 cleanup work

& ;nbs p;

DC Orr

to:

brad, Mike Cirian, catharine_ransom,
clecours, Sean Earle,
filmwest, gordsull, Lawrence Grandison,
Helen Dawson,
jpodolinsky, Victor Ketellapper, Kirby
Campbell-Rierson ,
larry.anderson, Andy Lensink, Ted Linnert,
Freya Margand,
Bill Murray, mvolesky, Rebecca Thomas,
rodriguez-newstroml,
suzi rios, Terry Spear , Virginia Sloan

06/07/2010 08:18

AM

Mr. Cirian;

I was able to view the work at OU-1 over the weekend and it raised some questions.

There is obvious visible vermiculite along the entire toe of the slope in the ramp access to this site. This has been identified as a major source of contamination. It would appear that EPA is not going to

remove this visible vermiculite. It has been laying there, uncovered, in a public park since your contractor exposed it 8-10 weeks ago.

There are tracks from various types of machinery that have trampled right through the pockets of visible vermiculite. Some of these tracks have left a visible trail where they tracked the contaminated soil into the sand your contractors had spread over some of the excavation to make the site accessible for the contractors installing the waterline. This cross contamination has the potential to come back on the people of Libby who have expressed interest in making a playground in that area since it will be only six inches underground and ICs are being designed for at least twelve inches of cover.

Can you tell me if there were any instructions to the waterline contractors to avoid these pockets of raw vermiculite while installing the 1700 foot utility? Were there procedures in place to decontaminate the installers equipment before they moved that equipment to another job? What were those procedures? Did you document compliance?

I have heard that the inspectors who watched the City crews dig this ditch sat in a City truck with the motor running to keep warm while they were on-site and couldn't always see the activity. This does not inspire confidence that these are professionals brought in to monitor work at the site with the greatest death and disease in the history of EPA. There are also rumors that drug testing recently eliminated a large section of trained personnel from your contractors roster. Please tell me this is not true.

There is topsoil dumped in some places where it is touching this exposed vermiculite. Is it your intention to avoid a cover of common fill before the topsoil goes on? This would leave only a six inch cover of topsoil between the raw product and the people

using this public
park. Is that acceptable to EPA?

Please answer these questions before the crews go
down there and
cover this up.

Sincerely, DC Orr

Hotmail has tools for the New Busy. Search, chat and
e-mail from your
inbox. Learn more.